



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,627	09/17/2001	Jeffrey C. Groat	13358.3USU1	6847

7590 08/06/2008
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL, INC.
PATENT SERVICES GROUP
101 COLUMBIA ROAD
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962

EXAMINER

CUFF, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/06/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/954,627

Applicant(s)

GROAT ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Cuff

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 50-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 50-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No./Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 50-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkowski in view of Want et al.

Perkowski shows all of the limitations of the claims except for specifying attaching to a particular instance of an asset a URL that is unique to the particular instance of the asset.

Perkowski shows, figure 4A1 (database, more than one asset) and abstract, a system and method for finding and serving consumer product-related information over the Internet to consumers in retail shopping environments, as well as at home and work, and on the road. The system includes Internet information servers which store information pertaining to Universal Product Number (e.g. UPC number, optically scannable) preassigned to each consumer product registered with the system, along with a list of Uniform Resource Locators (URLs, accessing link) (unique) that point to the location of one or more information resources on the Internet, e.g. World Wide Web-sites (web page, more than one), which related to such registered consumer products. Upon entering the UPC number into the system using a conventional Internet browser program running on any computing platform or system, the menu of

URLs associated with the entered UPC number is automatically displayed for user selection. The displayed menus of URLs are categorically arranged according to specific types of product information such as, for example: product specifications and operation manuals; product wholesalers and retailers (downstream; second entity); product advertisements and promotions; product endorsements; product updates and reviews; product warranty/servicing ("intangible"); related or complementary products; product incentives including rebates, discounts and/or coupons; manufacturer's annual report and 10K information; electronic stock purchase; etc. Web-based techniques are disclosed for collecting the UPC/URL information from manufacturers (upstream; first entity) and transmitting the same to the Internet-based databases (central database) of the system. Figure 4A2 show shows subfields related products. Inherent in the related products are components of a product that are sold separately. For example figure 4A1 shows a personal computer. Figure 4B shows a Netscape Navigator, which could be a component part of the computer and would be listed as a related product.

Want et al. teaches a system for obtaining and using information. Figure 4 and column 6 show a specific building or specific asset that has an encoded unique URL attached to the asset. This is done in order to be able to access information, in a very convenient manner, on the asset as shown by the laptop computer, which shows information about the asset on the unique URL.

Based on the teaching of Want et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the Perkowski system to incorporate the Want et al. mechanism between an object and the Perkowski

data system in order to provide a very convenient means of relating the object to more information about the object.

Claim Note

Applicant is now using the terms "first entity", "second entity" and "central database". While it is clear what they mean, the examiner believes that the original claim language, which is consistent with the specification, made the application more clear.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that the examiner has not complied with MPEP 707.07(d). The examiner does not concur. The part of the rejection that recites, "Claims 50-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perkowski in view of Want et al." meets the requirements of the grounds of rejection are to be fully and clearly stated per MPEP 707.07(d).

Applicant asserts that Perkowski does not indicate what entity enters the URL. The examiner does not concur. In reading the rejection and the reference it is clear that the manufacturer or upstream or first entity enters the first URL.

Applicant asserts that Perkowski does not cite any relationship between the URL and the supply chain entities that handle the product. The examiner is not sure what

claim language is not shown by this assertion because the assertion does specify which URL or what "relationship" is missing. The argument is not persuasive.

Applicant asserts that because the prior art discloses that an item could be a component part, it does not meet the test of inherency. The argument does not make sense because it confuses inherency with anticipation. If prior art discloses that a feature exist, the feature is anticipated.

Applicant asserts that Perkowski fails to show passing particular instance of the assets between the entities. The examiner does not concur. The passing of assets between manufacturer and retailers is inherent.

Applicant asserts that there is no motivation to combine the references. The examiner does not concur. In this day and age of technology and computers, the motivation of providing more information in a sales environment is obvious to increase sales and customer satisfaction.

Applicant asserts that the product warranty/servicing of Perkowski does not meet the limitation of a "service agreement". The examiner does not concur. There is no claim language limitation to distinguish the two features.

Applicant asserts that the prior art does not show multiple levels of information and charging varying rates to access each level. The examiner does not concur. Perkowski shows, column 13, line 51 to column 14, line 17, that commercial services (QRSolutions or QuickResponse Services, charging varying amount) provide access to different parts/levels of the catalog database depending on the service such as inventory or logistics.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Cuff whose telephone number is (571) 272-6778. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Cuff/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3627